



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/328,622      | 06/09/1999  | KEITH ALAN MARSHALL  | BO9-99-014          | 7058             |

22462 7590 09/11/2003

GATES & COOPER LLP  
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER  
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

SAFAIPOUR, HOUSHANG

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2622

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/328,622

Applicant(s)

MARSHALL ET AL.

Examiner

Houshang Safaipoor

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2622

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's amendment filed on June 25, 2003, has been entered and made of record.

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21, 23, 24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feder (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,845) and further in view of Berkley et al. (U.S. Patent Application publication No. 2002/0131573).

Regarding claim 1, Feder discloses a method of managing the distribution of facsimile messages to a recipient, comprising:

receiving a message from a transmitting facsimile via a telephone network message comprising receiving fax server telephone number appended with a recipient direct dial telephone number (col. 6, lines 41-64);

automatically parsing the message to extract the recipient direct dial telephone number from the message (col. 6, lines 41-64);

receiving a fax payload from the transmitting facsimile in the fax server (col. 6,

Art Unit: 2622

lines 3-23);

Feder does not explicitly disclose a method for determining an e-mail address and at least one recipient fax preference from the direct dial telephone number; processing the fax payload according to the recipient fax preference; and directing the processed fax message according to the recipient fax preference. Berkley et al. discloses a system with an ability to broker between a subscriber's request for communications contact information corresponding to a user and the user's preference of being reached by various communications alternatives (pages 5 and 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Berkley's design with that of Feder, because this addition would enhance Feder's design and would add more options for the subscribers.

Regarding claim 3, utilizing fax cards with facsimile apparatus is well known in the art and is routinely implemented facsimile operation (Official Notice). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Berkley's design with that of Feder, because this addition would enhance Feder's design and would add more options for the subscribers.

Regarding claim 4, Feder does not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the step of automatically parsing the message to extract the recipient direct dial telephone number from the message is performed by a processor responding to instructions to extract the recipient direct dial telephone number from the message. Berkley discloses a system capable of performing these functions (page 6, paragraph [0068]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2622

at the time the invention was made to combine Berkley's design with that of Feder, because this addition would enhance Feder's design and would add more options for the subscribers.

Regarding claim 5, Feder does not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining an e-mail address and at least one recipient fax preference from the direct dial telephone number comprises the steps of:

calling an application program interface in the fax server to an application managing recipient information comprising the e-mail address and the direct dial telephone number of the recipient; and searching the recipient information for the e-mail address corresponding to the direct dial telephone number. Berkley discloses a system capable of performing these functions (page 6, paragraphs [0068, 0069 and 0070]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Berkley's design with that of Feder, because this addition would enhance Feder's design and would add more options for the subscribers.

Regarding claim 8, Feder does not disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the fax preference describes forwarding fax information, and the method further comprises the step of forwarding the fax message according to the forwarding fax information. Berkley et al. discloses a system with an ability to broker between a subscriber's request for communications contact information corresponding to a user and the user's preference of being reached by various communications alternatives (pages 5 and 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Berkley's design with that of Feder, because this addition would enhance Feder's design and would add more options for the subscribers.

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claims 11, 13, 14, 15 and 18 arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 3, 4, 5 and 8 are applicable to claims 11, 13, 14, 15 and 18 respectively.

Regarding claims 21, 23, 24, and 27 arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 3, 5 and 8 are applicable to claims 21, 23, 24, and 27 respectively.

Claims 2, 12 and 22 are rejected as being unpatentable over Feder, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,845) and in view Berkley et al. (U.S. Patent Application publication No. 2002/0131573) and further in view of Brossman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,498,661).

Regarding claim 2, neither Feder nor Berkley disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the step of processing the fax payload in the fax server according to the recipient fax preference comprises the steps of:

reading a grayscale transform from a memory accessible to the fax server; and applying the grayscale transform to the fax payload. Brossman et al. discloses a system with capability of applying the grayscale transform to the fax payload (col. 12, lines 4-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Brossman's design in combination of Feder and Berkley's system, because this addition would enhance the design and would add more options for the subscribers.

Regarding claims 12 and 22 arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2 are applicable to claims 12 and 22.

Claims 6, 16 and 25 are rejected as being unpatentable over Feder (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,845) and in view of Berkley et al. (U.S. Patent Application publication No. 2002/0131573) and further in view of Reifman (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,615).

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 6 neither Feder nor Berkley disclose the method of claim 1, the message further comprises a transmitting facsimile identification and wherein the fax preference describes an identification of a junk fax source, and the step of processing the converted fax message according to the recipient fax preferences comprises the step of deleting the received fax payload if the transmitting facsimile identification corresponds to the identification of the junk fax source. Reifman discloses a system capable of eliminating junk facsimile messages (col. 33, lines 40-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Reifman's design in combination of Feder and Berkley's system, because this addition would enhance the design and would add more options for the subscribers.

Regarding claims 16 and 25 arguments analogous to those presented for claim 6 are applicable to claims 16 and 25.

Claims 7, 17 and 26 are rejected as being unpatentable over Feder (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,845) and in view of Berkley et al. (U.S. Patent Application publication No. 2002/0131573) and further in view of Bobo, II (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,507).

Regarding claim 7, neither Feder nor Berkley disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the fax preference describes a preferred portable document format, and the step of processing the fax payload in the fax server comprises the step of converting the fax payload to the preferred portable document format. Bobo discloses a system capable of converting the fax messages to portable document format (col. 11, lines 24-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Bobo's design in combination of Feder and

Art Unit: 2622

Berkley's system, because this addition would enhance the design and would add more options for the subscribers.

Regarding claims 17 and 26 arguments analogous to those presented for claim 7 are applicable to claims 17 and 26.

Claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 28 and 29 are rejected as being unpatentable over Feder, (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,845) and in view of Berkley et al. (U.S. Patent Application publication No. 2002/0131573) and further in view of Choksi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,477,243).

Regarding claim 9, neither Feder nor Berkley disclose the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of transmitting a confirming message to the transmitting facsimile. Choksi et al. discloses a system capable of transmitting a confirming message to the transmitting facsimile (col. 6, lines 66-67 and col. 7, lines 1-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Choksi's design in combination of Feder and Berkley's system, because this addition would enhance the design and would add more options for the subscribers

Regarding claim 10, neither Feder nor Berkley disclose the method of claim 9, wherein the confirming message comprises a portion of the fax payload. Choksi et al. discloses a system capable of transmitting a confirming message to the transmitting facsimile (col. 6, lines 66-67 and col. 7, lines 1-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Choksi's design in combination of Feder and Berkley's system, because this addition would enhance the design and would add more options for the subscribers



Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claims 19 and 28 arguments analogous to those presented for claim 9 are applicable to claims 19 and 28.

Regarding claims 20 and 29 arguments analogous to those presented for claim 10 are applicable to claims 20 and 29.

Claims 30-32 are rejected as being unpatentable over Feder, (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,845) and in view of Berkley et al. (U.S. Patent Application publication No. 2002/0131573) and further in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,007,054).

Regarding claim 30 neither Feder nor Berkley disclose the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of: detecting whether the faxload is essentially identical to an earlier received fax payload. Lee et al. discloses such a system (col. 8, lines 59-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Lee's design in combination of Feder and Berkley's system, because this addition would enhance the design and would add more options for the subscribers

Regarding claims 31 and 32 the arguments analogous to those presented for claim 30 are applicable to claims 31 and 32.


### *Conclusion*


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Houshang Safaipoor whose telephone number is (703)306-4037. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2622

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles, Sr. can be reached on (703) 305-4712. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)306-0377.

 Houshang Safaipoor  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2622  
September 6, 2003

  
EDWARD COLES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600